

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/822,735	SUN ET AL.	

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
BARBARA N. BURGESS	2457	

**All Participants:**

(1) BARBARA N. BURGESS.

**Status of Application:** Amendment

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Thinh Nguyen.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 5 May 2010

**Time:** Evening

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*102 and 103 (Shiigi and Shiigi in view of Lewis)*

Claims discussed:

1, 8

Prior art documents discussed:

*Shiigi and Lewis references*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's representative Thinh Nguyen to discuss the packetier step of claim 1 and the enabling and disabling function of claim 8. Thinh Nguyen explained these limitations and how they execute with the rest of the claim limitations. No agreement was made..